

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-13 are amended. New claims 14-25 are added. No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims and new claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Independent claim 1, claims 4 and 10, claims 6 and 12, and claim 8 are amended to recite a disclosing method, a disclosing system, a central apparatus, and a computer memory product respectively, that include, for example, "extracting a HP title and a URL of an individual storage location based on the received identification information and the registered authorized user information; (and) generating a document containing a hyperlink including the extracted HP title wherein hyperlink to the extracted URL of the individual storage location is defined." (See, for example, pages 14-15 starting at line 12).

Dependent claims 2-3, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13 are amended to correspond to claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 respectively.

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

ITEMS 2-3: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-2 AND 4-13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) BY OTOBE (U.S. PUB. NO. 2004/0010599)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-2 and 4-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Otope.

As provided in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that the reference must teach every aspect of a claimed invention.

According to aspects of the present invention, different storage locations of browsable information of respective users who are to browse the information are provided. Otope merely teaches (See, for example, paragraph 22) storing and processing individual identification data, and does not support an anticipatory-type rejection by not describing features recited by the present application's claims.

Features Of Independent Claims Not Taught By Otope

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a disclosing method including "accepting headline information of the browsable information, authorized user information of a user authorized to browse the browsable information, and storage location information of the browsable information; registering the accepted headline information and the authorized user information in

association with the storage location information; . . . extracting an HP title and a URL of an individual storage location based on the received identification information and the registered authorized user information; (and) generating a document containing a hyperlink including the extracted HP title wherein hyperlink to the extracted URL of the individual storage location is defined.”

The Examiner contends these features are taught by Otobe, citing paragraphs 5, 6, 21, and 22. (Action at pages 2-3).

Applicants submit that while Otobe teaches a data comparison for user authorization Otobe does not teach accepting headline information of browsable information and storage location information of browsable information, in the cited paragraphs or anywhere else, as the Examiner contends. Otobe merely teaches (paragraph 6):

. . . circuit 58 compares sets of the fingerprint data thus acquired with sets of the individual ID data stored as fingerprint data . . . if they mismatch, the transmission is disabled.

Applicants further submit that Otobe does not teach registering accepted headline and the authorized user information in association with the storage location information, as the Examiner contends. Otobe merely teaches (paragraph 5):

. . . the individual ID data stored in the ROM . . . is retrieved and temporarily stored in RAM. . . a user presses a transmission button . . . then enters a telephone number and presses the transmission button . . . thereby performing transmission processing.

That is, while Otobe *arguendo* teaches a registering of an ID code, Otobe does not teach registering headline information in association with a storage location information.

Likewise, Applicants submit that Otobe does not teach extracting an HP title and a URL. Rather, Otobe merely teaches (paragraphs 21-22) that a device:

. . . compares the individual identification information . . . to the pieces of individual identification data stored in the storage means . . . to specify an individual, so that each of the individual users who use the portable terminal apparatus can be identified . . . to be compared to the pieces of individual identification data stored.

That is, while Otobe teaches a comparison for user authorization, Otobe does not teach extracting a HP title and a URL of an individual storage location.

Further, while Otobe teaches a "processing," e.g., paragraph 25, Otobe does not teach generating a document containing a hyperlink based on headline information of Web contents or a URL.

Applicants further submit that, similarly, features of independent claims 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 are likewise not taught by Otobe as the Examiner contends, in the cited paragraphs, or anywhere else.

Features Of Dependent Claims Not Taught By Otobe

Dependent claims 2, 5, 7, 9 (all as amended) recite accepting "accepts limitation information limiting browsing of the browsable information," the registering "registers the accepted headline information . . . in association with the storage location information," and the extracting "extracts the HP title and the URL of the individual storage location based . . . when the request is sent through the auxiliary communication network." The Examiner contends these features are taught by Otobe, citing paragraphs 1, 21, and 22. (Action at pages 3-10).

Applicants submit that such recited features are not taught within the cited paragraphs of Otobe or elsewhere. Otobe merely teaches, for example, in paragraph 1:

. . . a distributing system and a distributing method each for providing a variety of kinds of distribution services using a large-sized image display means. . .

Otobe does not teach, for example, any limiting browsing of browsable information or extracting headline information, as the Examiner contends.

Conclusion

Since Otobe does not describe features recited in claims 1-2 and 4-13, the rejections should be withdrawn and claims allowed.

ITEM 4: REJECTION OF CLAIM 3 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) BY OTOBE IN VIEW OF BUCKLAND (U.S.P. 5,999,971)

The Examiner rejects claim 3 for obviousness over Otobe in view of Buckland. (Action at pages 15-16).

***Prima Facie* Obviousness Not Established**

As provided in MPEP §2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 1981, (CCPA 1974)."

Features Not Taught By Cited Art Alone Or in Combination

The Action concedes that Otobe does not teach the recited features of claim 3 that accepting "accepts first storage location information . . ." (Action at page 15). Nevertheless, the Examiner contends the feature is taught by Buckland, citing FIG. 2 characters "200 and 202," and col. 5, lines 37-55. (Action at page 15). The Action also concedes that Otobe does not teach that registering " registers the accepted headline information. . ." (Action at page 15). The Examiner contends the feature is taught by Buckland, citing FIG. 3, characters "314." (Action at page 15).

The Action also concedes that Otobe does not teach that extracting "extracts the headline information and the first storage location information. . ." (Action at pages 14-15). The

Examiner contends the feature is taught by Buckland, citing FIG. 6 characters "602" and col. 10, lines 1-12. (Action at page 16).

Applicants submit that Buckland merely teaches (col. 5, lines 37-55) different network sites and servers, and does not teach different networks, e.g., that a request is accepted through an auxiliary communication network different from a communication network. In addition, Applicants submit that Buckland merely teaches (col. 7, lines 42-46) the term "register," Buckland does not teach registering accepted headline information in association with first and second storage location information.

Further, Buckland merely teaches (col. 7, lines 42-46) extracting an identifier from a message and transmitting data to network sites, Buckland does not teach extracting headline information and first storage location information when a request is sent through a communication network and second storage location information when request is sent through an auxiliary communication network.

Summary

Since features are not taught by the cited art and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 3 allowed.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 14-17 recite a disclosing method including accepting headline information, authorized user information, and storage location information of the browsable information. New claims 18-21 recite a computer-readable storage storing a program for controlling a computer to perform disclosing browsable information by accepting headline information. New claims 22-25 recite a central apparatus including a memory storing browsable information; and a processor connectable to the memory, wherein the processor accepts headline information, authorized user information

These, and other, features of claims 14-25 are patentably distinguishable from the cited art, and they are submitted to be allowable for the recitations therein.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 19, 2004

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501